



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/821,064

03/29/2001

Messaoud Benantar

AUS920010140US1

5311

65362 7590 07/02/2007

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION  
c/o HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP  
P.O. BOX 203518  
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/02/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,064	BENANTAR, MESSAOUD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher J. Brown	2134	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/18/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, filed 9/26/2006, with respect to USC 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The USC 101 rejection of claim 1 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues against the rejection of claim 1, because in part, the rejection fails to address encryption and an encryption key. The examiner argues that this information is not in claim 1, and is addressed in the dependent claims which do state encryption.

Applicant argues against motivation stating that a certificate from a trusted source is not motivation to combine the certificate of Parker US 5,339,403 with the Single Sign On system of Wood US 6,691,232. The examiner disagrees. As stated in Wood, the user submits credentials, which are authenticated. Parker teaches a privilege attribute certificate which may be presented to authenticate a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Parker's certificate which contains rights common to a plurality of applications, as the credentials Woods implements.

Further arguments from the applicants comprise general submissions that the motivation of other 103 combinations is not obvious. The examiner argues

Art Unit: 2134

against this and cites the motivation statement in the office action below, as well as that the references are of an analogous art.

Below is a rejection substantially similar to the previous non-final rejection:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232, in view of Parker US 5,339,403**

As per claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 19, and 21, Wood teaches use of a certificate for authentication in a single sign on system, (Col 5 lines 50-65). Wood teaches authenticating the user for subsequent authentication via the certificate, (Col 6 lines 4-10).

Wood does not teach an attribute certificate.

Parker teaches an attribute certificate including authentication information, (Col 1 lines 40-45). Parker teaches a system to approve access by and authenticate by forwarding the attribute certificate to a controlled resource (applications) (Col 1 lines 45-50).

Art Unit: 2134

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Wood with the certificate of Parker because the certificate is from a trusted secure source.

**Claims 2, 5, 12, 15, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 in view of Riggins US 6,766,454.**

As per claims 2, 5, 12, 15, 20, and 23, the prior Wood-Parker combination teaches an SSO attribute certificate including authentication information.

Wood-Parker does not teach asymmetrical encryption.

Riggins teaches encryption of messages with the public key of the recipient, and decryption with a private key (Col 2 lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the encryption of Riggins with the certificate of Parker, because the encryption makes the communication secure.

**Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 Olden US 6,460,141**

As per claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 25, the Wood-Parker combination teaches a certificate containing, an issuer name (AID), signature (KUA), and holder, (Attr), (Parker Col 3 lines 5-30). Wood-Parker does not teach legacy applications and multiple sets of data.

Art Unit: 2134

As per claims Olden teaches using a user Id and password in conjunction with legacy applications, wherein multiple sets of authentication data and parameters are stored in conjunction with single sign on (Col 25 lines 20-27)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the legacy application of Olden in the system of Wood-Parker, because it is important to maintain backwards compatibility.

**Claims 8, 18, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 in view of Butt US 6,754,829**

As per claims 7, 20, and 31, the previous Wood-Parker combination does not disclose a X.509 certificate format.

Butt teaches the X.509 certificate format, (Col 4 lines 54-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the x.509 format with the certificate of the Parker-Riggins combination because the x.509 format is operating system independent and thus very compatible.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the

Art Unit: 2134

advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher J. Brown

6/26/07

  
KAMBIZ ZAND  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER